REMARKS

I. Status of the Claims

Claims 1-7 were pending in the application.

All the claims were rejected.

No claims were allowed.

By way of this response, the Applicant submits the following remarks for the consideration of the Examiner.

Accordingly, Claims 1-7 are pending in the application.

I. Objections to the Specification

The Examiner objected to the specification, stating that:

> The abstract is objected because the abstract is a copy of the summary. Corrected abstract of the disclosure is required and must be presented on a separate sheet, apart from any other text.
> A patent abstract is a concise statement of technical disclosure of the patent and should include what is that which is new in the art to which the invention pertains. If the patent is of a basic nature, the entire technical disclosure may be new in the art, and the abstract should be directed to the entire disclosure. If the patent is in the nature of an improvement to an old apparatus, process, product, or composition, the abstract should include the technical disclosure of the improvement. In certain patents, particularly those for compounds and compositions, wherein the process for making and/or the use thereof is not obvious, the abstract should set forth a process for making and/or use thereof. If the new technical disclosure involves modifications or alternatives, the abstract should mention by way of example, the preferred modification or alternative. The abstract should not refer to purported merits or speculative applications of the invention should not compare the invention with the prior art.

Although the Applicant believes that the abstract submitted comports with 37 C.F.R. § 1.72(b) and the guidance found in MPEP § 608.01(b), enclosed is an amendment to the abstract. In

particular, the abstract of the present application identifies the nature of the invention and,

furthermore, it describes the steps involved in the novel method of the present application.

Therefore, the Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the objection.

II.   Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

The Examiner rejected claims 1-7 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S.

Patent No. 6,453,314, issued to Chan. Specifically, the Examiner stated:

> As per independent claim 1, Chan teaches a method and for use in
> a database management system for managing a database containing
> data and has storage for data in the database (col. 12, lines 14-19).
> Chan teaches the claimed, providing a database capable of having
> record data loaded therein (Fig. 3, 9a, col. 12, lines 35-40). Chan
> teaches the claimed, providing a computer's main memory (Fig. 3,
> col. 6, lines 38-43). Chan teaches the claimed, providing record
> data for loading into the database and the record data residing in
> the computer's main memory (Fig. 3, col. 6, lines 38-43). Chan
> teaches the claimed, invoking a coordinating program (Fig. 3, col.
> 6, lines 44-45). Chan teaches the claimed, invoking a load utility
> program that issues record data input requests, opens record data
> from external media and loads record data to the database
> therefrom and the load utility having a required syntax (Fig. 3, col.
> 12, lines 60-63). Chan teaches the claimed, with the coordinating
> program, intercepting record data input requests from external
> media made by the load utility program (Fig. 3, col. lines 38-43).
> Chan teaches the claimed, replacing the record data input request
> from external media with record data input requests from the
> computer's main memory (Fig. 9b, 11, col. 13, lines 42-49). Chan
> teaches the claimed, inserting record data from the computer's
> main memory directly into the database by the load utility and
> whereby delays encountered by reading of input files on the
> external media by the load utility is avoided (Fig. 3, 11, col. 6,
> lines 38-43 and col. 13, lines 45-49).

The Applicant respectfully disagrees. Although Chan discloses prior art methods of bulk loading

of data into databases, these are the same prior art techniques that are disclosed in the

"Background of the Invention" section the present application as prior art and that the present

invention was created to improve upon. In particular, Chan does not disclose the use of a
separate coordinating program which intercepts data input requests made by the load utility
program. Although Col 6, lines 38 to 43 and 44-45 of Chan refers to a "control program" as
initiating and controlling the bulk data load, this component is the same prior art component that
the applicant refers to as "the load utility program" as in paragraph [0009] of Applicant's
specification. Chan makes no reference to another coordinating program capable of intercepting
data input commands from the control program. Moreover, Chan makes no reference to the data
requests being redirected from data stored on slower mass storage devices to data stored in faster
memory. In fact, Chan specifically details in Col. 12, lines 36-38 that the data it is bulk loading is
originating from mass storage. This fact is not surprising considering that the parts of Chan that
the Examiner cites describe prior art techniques of loading bulk data into a database, which are
the same techniques described as prior art in the "Background of the Invention" section of the
present application. The focus of Chan is on ensuring that the bulk data load, no matter how
accomplished, is done properly i.e. through constraint processing, which Chan describes in great
detail.

The Examiner asserts that Fig. 9b and 11 accompanying col. 13 lines 42-49, disclose the
step of replacing the record data input request from external media with record data input
requests from the computer's main memory. However, referencing these sections of Chan, we
find that Chan is describing bulk loading of table data that is split across multiple partitions from
mass storage. (Col. 12, lines 36-38). Chan does not describe the technique of redirecting these
date load requests from data stored in slower mass storage devices, such as hard disks, to data
already stored in faster computer memory.

The heart of the present invention is the use of a coordinating program in addition to the control program or load utility program to bulk load the data. The coordinating program of the present invention intercepts the data load requests from the control program and redirects them to data that is stored in memory rather than on disk. As can readily ascertained, redirecting data load requests to data already in memory necessarily speeds up the bulk data load because mass storage devices do not need to be accessed, which, because they are electro-mechanical devices, are necessarily slower than the solid-state circuitry used in computer memories.

Accordingly, because Chan does not disclose the use of a separate coordinating program which intercepts and redirects record data input requests from a load utility program, Chan does not anticipate the claims of the present invention.

Therefore, the Applicant respectfully solicits reconsideration of the pending claims.

III.   Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, the Applicant respectfully solicits reconsideration of the pending claims.

The USPTO is authorized to charge any additional fees incurred as a result of the filing hereof or credit any overpayment to our account #02-0900.

Respectfully submitted,

/Joshua A. Stockwell/

_____
Joshua A. Stockwell, Esq.
Reg. No. 54,580

BARLOW, JOSEPHS & HOLMES, Ltd.
101 Dyer Street, 5th Floor
Providence, RI 02903

401-273-4446 (tel)
401-273-4447 (fax)